

COMMENT LETTER

RESPONSES

Pacific Institute comments on
the Interim Surplus Criteria DEIS
September 8, 2000 Page 6 of 14

cont'd

therefore offers less benefit for the successful recruitment of native riparian vegetation such as cottonwoods and willows than if these releases more closely mimicked the river's natural flood regime.

THE DEIS**POTENTIAL AFFECTED AREA**

13

The DEIS notes the requirement to assess transboundary impacts, pursuant to Executive Order 12114 and the Council on Environmental Quality Guidelines on NEPA Analyses for Transboundary Impacts, as well as the regulations implementing Endangered Species Act consultations with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service. Yet the DEIS states that the potential area of impact extends downstream only as far as the Northerly International Boundary (NIB) (p. 3.2-1). This is inconsistent with the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program (MSCP) planning area, which extends as far south as the Southerly International Boundary (SIB), 23 miles further south. It is also inconsistent with the controlling legal authority noted above. Ironically, Map 3.2-1 of the DEIS identifies the "Area of Potential Effect" as extending below the NIB, below the SIB, as far downstream as the river's mouth at the Gulf of California.

The geographic scope of the DEIS should be broadened as well as lengthened. Below Morelos Dam, the river's floodplain widens toward the south. The entire region within the levees in Mexico should be included as the potentially impacted area, as releases of sufficient magnitude to cause overbank flooding could potentially inundate much or all of this area; the 100-year floodplain is much broader in the delta than it is upstream. The DEIS should list the size of the affected area for each of the reaches of the river examined and include specific vegetation coverages for each area. Much of this information has been compiled by the MSCP for the U.S. reach of the river, and has also been documented for the Mexican region.²

14

Historically, the Colorado River emptied into the upper Gulf of California, creating one of the world's most productive estuaries. As a result of flood control releases in the mid-1980s and again starting in 1997, water again flows into the Upper Gulf. These flows generate measurable ecological and economic benefits. Such benefits would be negatively impacted by the projected reductions in flows due to the implementation of surplus criteria. These impacts should be analyzed in the supplemental DEIS.

15

The letter (in Attachment Q) from Arturo Herrera, Commissioner of the Mexican counterpart to the US State Department's IBWC, highlights several other potential impacts resulting from the implementation of surplus criteria, including reduced recharge of the Mexicali aquifer. Annual overdraft of the aquifer is partly offset at present by infiltration from periodic Colorado River flood flows. Absent this periodic recharge, the level of the water table would drop more rapidly, increasing the hydrologic gradient under the border and drawing groundwater from the U.S. Such indirect impacts extend the area of potential effect and should be analyzed as part of the

13: Potential effects on special-status species within the expanded area of potential effect are addressed Section 3.8 of the FEIS. Map 3.2-1 has been revised to more accurately represent the area of potential effect considered within the U.S. as well as areas within Mexico that are addressed in Section 3.16, Transboundary Impacts.

14: See response to Comment 12-8.

15: Reclamation believes that the analysis presented in this section. Section 3.16, Transboundary Impacts, has been modified for the FEIS and adequately and appropriately identifies potential effects of interim surplus criteria in Mexico. Note that Reclamation is committed to working with Mexico to address specific concerns.

² See Daniel F. Luecke et al. 1999. *A Delta Once More: Restoring Riparian and Wetland Habitat in the Colorado River Delta*. Washington, DC: Environmental Defense Fund Publications, pp. 20-29.

Pacific Institute comments on
the Interim Surplus Criteria DEIS
September 8, 2000 Page 7 of 14

cont'd

NEPA process. Commissioner Herrera also underscores the potential environmental impacts on the delta resulting from surplus criteria.³

Reclamation dismisses Commissioner Herrera's concerns by stating that "it is not clear that these concerns are a result of interim surplus criteria" (3.16-3). Dismissing these concerns violates the spirit of consultation with Mexico. And, as noted in the DEIS, the selected alternative will alter the frequency and magnitude of flood flows reaching Mexico, indicating that such concerns are in fact real. The supplemental DEIS should extend the area of potential impacts to encompass the full range of potential impacts to the delta region and the Upper Gulf of California, as well as regions indirectly impacted due to reduced recharge of the Mexicali aquifer and the likely increase in transboundary groundwater flows due to increased pumping in Mexico.

DEIS AND HABITAT

16

The DEIS fails to provide an adequate description of the habitat and species composition present along the lower Colorado River in the U.S. and in Mexico below Morelos Dam. The DEIS should provide a map displaying the various vegetation coverages along the river downstream of Mohave Dam, to reflect riparian and wetland habitat present in the various wildlife refuges along the river and within the delta in Mexico. The minimum stage necessary to freshen backwaters along the mainstem of the river and to inundate the floodplain in Mexico should be indicated on the map, along with a projected frequency interval at which these conditions would be satisfied under the different alternatives under consideration. The DEIS offers only generalized information and aggregated acreage estimates, despite the fact that more refined data exist.⁴

16: Potential effects on special-status species within the river corridor between Hoover Dam and the SIB are addressed in the BA for ISC/SIAs and have been summarized in Section 3.8 of the FEIS.

17

The DEIS does not address the significant difference in the quantity and frequency of water reaching the delta that the model projects for the flood control alternative and the Six States' Plan. Table 3.16-1 indicates that, in the year 2015, the probability of flood flows reaching the delta is more than 16 percent greater under the flood control alternative than under the Six States' Plan. The reduced frequency of flows to the affected area under the Six States Plan would cause further harm to habitat in the area, subsequently impacting the species that depend on this habitat. The DEIS should analyze these impacts.

17: The EIS discusses these potential effects as necessary to identify the differences between each of the alternatives compared to baseline conditions. Table 3.16-1 has been updated in the FEIS with revised data.

18

Section 3.16.6.1 states that reductions in flows below the NIB were instituted through the 1944 Treaty. This statement is incorrect and is likely not what was intended. The Treaty establishes minimum, not maximum, flows. In fact, the Treaty increased the quantity of flows that the U.S. was prepared to deliver to Mexico.⁵ The responsibility for the dramatic reductions in the flow of the Colorado River to its delta, from historic levels of roughly 14 MAF/year to zero in most years, lies with U.S. interests.

18: Comment noted. Section 3.16.6.1 has been revised to state that "...reductions have been instituted while meeting the requirements of an international treaty and the diversion and use of such treaty water is solely at Mexico's discretion." At least since execution of the Treaty, it is incorrect to state that responsibility for reductions of flows to Colorado River delta lies with U.S. interests alone.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

19

NEPA requires a cumulative impacts analysis: the cumulative impacts of surplus criteria atop increased upper basin consumption and continued excessive use by California, among other

19: See response to Comment 12-5.

³ Note that "álamos" in the Commissioner's letter is correctly translated as "cottonwoods."

⁴ See Daniel F. Luecke et al. 1999. *A Delta Once More*, pp. 20-29.

⁵ Norris Hundley, jr. 1966. *Dividing the Waters: A Century of Controversy between the United States and Mexico*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Pacific Institute comments on
the Interim Surplus Criteria DEIS
September 8, 2000 Page 8 of 14

cont'd

actions, can not be dismissed. The DEIS provides less than a page on cumulative impacts (4.2). The cumulative impacts analysis should list and describe all of the federal and non-federal actions that could impact the affected area, including reasonably foreseeable future actions. These listed impacts should then be analyzed in light of the additional incremental impacts posed by the surplus criteria. The DEIS dismisses the potential incremental impacts due to the selection of a preferred set of surplus criteria, stating that “the potential effects of interim surplus criteria are likely to be negligible ...” relative to other actions. This is not an adequate cumulative impacts analysis.

PACIFIC INSTITUTE PROPOSAL

20

The “Environmental Interim Surplus Criteria,” submitted by ten NGOs and subsequently endorsed by the Center for Biological Diversity and The Wilderness Society, should be analyzed in a supplemental DEIS. These criteria would satisfy the objective of facilitating California’s reduction in its use of Colorado River water, without forcing the environment to bear the costs of such actions. Although similar in many respects to the Six States Plan, the Environmental Criteria differ sufficiently to merit appraisal in a supplemental DEIS.

20: See responses to Comment 11-8 and 13-4.

In the following, and per previous conversations and correspondence with Reclamation staff, we offer suggestions as to how best to model the Environmental Interim Surplus Criteria, and suggest several specific projections that should be included in the supplemental DEIS.

Clarifications:

21

- Reclamation should model the monthly release schedule under “2) baseline delta flows” so that these delta flows are relatively constant throughout the year
- Reclamation should model the monthly release schedule under “5) delta flood flows” so that 100% of such releases are made from May through July, peaking in June at a ratio of 35%: 45%: 20% (flows in other months would be released by the baseline flow trigger, above)
- Due to difficulties in modeling a Secretarial determination of “No Net Loss,” for the purposes of modeling Reclamation should assume that such a determination is made

21: Reclamation has noted the clarifications of the Pacific Institute's proposed interim surplus criteria, and the recital of differences between its proposal and the Seven States Proposal. The revised provisions of Pacific Institute's plan have been included in Attachment F of the FEIS entitled Surplus Criteria Proposal by Pacific Institute.

Differences between the Environmental Criteria (“NGO”) and the 7 States’ Plan (“States”):

- **Normal elevation trigger:** ≤ 1120.4 for NGO, ≤ 1125 for States
- **Baseline delta flows** 0.032 MAF above elevation 1120.4 for NGO; none for States
- **Partial M&I/Domestic surplus elevation** triggered between 1125 & 1145 for both; for purposes of these modeling runs, the quantities of water released under the two plans are equivalent
- **Full M&I/Domestic Surplus** triggered above elevation 1145. NGO plan equivalent to States’ plan with the following exceptions: Total deliveries through the Colorado River Aqueduct would be limited to 1.212 million acre-feet under the NGO plan instead of 1.250 under the States’ plan
- **Delta Flood Flows** triggered by Reclamation 70 percent flood control avoidance elevation (70A1) under the NGO plan; no such release under the States’

Pacific Institute comments on
the Interim Surplus Criteria DEIS
September 8, 2000 Page 9 of 14

cont'd

- **Full Surplus/Quantified Surplus** 70R trigger for both plans, although for the purposes of determining the trigger elevation the NGO plan considers the above delta baseline and flood flows as “uses” and the States plan does not (so the trigger elevation will be higher under the NGO plan). Unlike the States’ plan, under the NGO plan, no water would be made available to California or Nevada for off-stream storage, including groundwater banking, under this tier, and no surplus water would be made available to Arizona for such purposes under this tier.
- **Flood Control Surplus** equivalent for the two plans
- **Shortage Criteria** the NGO plan does not establish shortage criteria

Requested information:

22: Comment noted.

22

- Probabilities of shortage under the two plans, using the States’ definition of shortage
- Probabilities of delta flood flow releases over time
- Probabilities and projected quantities of flows below all major diversions, under the two plans
- Probabilities and projected quantities of flow released under Partial M&I/Domestic surplus, under the two plans, until year 2016

23

The DEIS states that “the delivery of water to or through Mexico would require modification of the Treaty” (2-3). This is incorrect. The Treaty requires the U.S. to deliver a minimum quantity of flows to Mexico; it does not limit the amount of water the U.S. may deliver. In 1998, the U.S. delivered more than 3.0 MAF over Treaty obligations; in 1984, the U.S. delivered more than 13.8 MAF over Treaty obligations. The development and implementation of interim surplus criteria are subject not only to the demands of California and the basin states, but to the Law of the River and the laws of the United States, including NEPA and the ESA. Within this broader context, the proposed environmental surplus criteria are appropriate. Reclamation and the basin states will likely come to find that the limited dedication of resources for environmental purposes outlined in the environmental criteria are far more benign than the mitigation that will be required should they choose to ignore environmental impacts in the U.S. and Mexico.

23: See response to Comment 18.

MODELING

The adoption of interim surplus criteria would create a new set of operational instructions for managing the river; it would not require the construction of new infrastructure. The direct environmental impacts of such criteria would be limited to the effects of changes in river operation. To project the potential impacts of such changes, Reclamation created a basin-wide model that uses the historical record (since 1906) of Colorado River flows to predict future inflows to the system and releases from Lake Mead. As noted by Reclamation, the results of the model are most sensitive to projections of future inflows, the least reliable data. The accuracy of the model also decreases the further it projects into the future. Reclamation contends that the main value of the model is that it allows for an analysis of the relative impacts between the proposed alternatives, rather than an analysis of the absolute impacts of any one alternative.